

REMARKS

In the current Office Action, the Examiner first rejects claims 4 to 14 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. These rejections are dealt with in the foregoing amendment. The phrase “the steel box” in claim 4, which lacked antecedent basis, has been changed to –the box–, which has antecedent basis in line 2 of this claim. The Examiner also argues that the reference to the “object” in claims 9 and 12 is improper since the object is not set forth as part of the invention. Claim 9 has now been canceled and replaced with new independent claim 15, which is believed to overcome this rejection. Claim 15 defines the panel overlays forming a façade “for simulating a predetermined object”, making it clear that the object itself is not part of the invention. Amended claim 12 also defines the panel overlays as moldings of respective adjacent vertical sections of an object to be simulated by the façade.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments deal with the Examiner’s rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and reconsideration and reversal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 to 12 and 14 are rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,148,896 of Pinto. The Examiner contends that Pinto sets forth a façade for a roll-up door comprising a set of rectangular panel overlays (members 46 to 48) aligning with one another and forming a gap. This rejection is hereby traversed and it is submitted that new claim 15, which replaces claim 9, as well as claims 12 and 14, are all fully distinguished from this reference. Claims 10 and 11 have been canceled.

Referring to claim 15, Pinto does not describe or suggest one-piece rectangular panel overlays of predetermined shape and dimensions corresponding to the shape and dimensions of a panel of a roll-up door. Instead, the overlay 25 of Pinto is formed from various transverse and end members 26, 28, 31, and 32 and end members 27 which form a pattern protruding from the surface of the door panels, but do not completely cover the outer surfaces of the panels. This is also clear from Figure 2, where it can be seen that the overlay members project outwardly from door panels 11, 12, 13 and 14 but do not completely cover the panels. The outer surfaces of the panels are therefore

visible between the overlay members. This is also clear from the description of how the overlay is applied to the door, from column 4, line 55 to column 5, line 67. A second embodiment also involves separate overlay members which extend over but do not completely cover the panels. In Pinto, a number of overlay members extends over each panel, and none of these completely covers a panel.

It is therefore submitted that claim 15 is not anticipated by Pinto.

Claims 12 and 14 depend from claim 15 and are distinguished from Pinto for the same reason, and additionally since these claims define other features which are absent from Pinto.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 8 and 13 as obvious in view of Pinto when combined with U.S. Patent No. 4,550,540 of Thorn. This rejection is hereby traversed, and it is submitted that amended claim 1, dependent claims 2 to 8 and 13, and new independent claims 16 and 17, are not obvious in view of these references.

The Examiner contends that the only difference between Pinto and the claimed invention is the forming of an overlay out of molded urethane material, and that it would be obvious to use such a material in Pinto in view of the teachings of Thorn. This is not correct. There are other differences between Pinto and the invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 16, and 17, as well as the dependent claims, which are also not suggested by Thorn. Referring to amended claim 1, Pinto does not describe or suggest panel sections for a roll-up door in which each section comprises a panel and a one-piece panel overlay secured to the outer surface of the panel and completely covering the outer surface. Pinto has a number of rib-like overlays secured across each panel, which do not completely cover the outer surface of each panel either separately or together. Instead, the overlays together cover only a portion of the outer surface of each panel. Thorn describes a single panel door, not a roll-up door with multiple panel sections, and does not have panels with overlays secured to the outer surface of each panel. Instead, the door comprises a pair of opposed compression molded door panels or skins 21, 22 forming the opposite side faces of the door, which are attached to a

perimeter frame 23. The space between the skins is filled with a foam core 24 (see Figures 3 to 7). Thorn has only a single, foam-filled panel with no overlay secured to an outer surface of the panel. The door structure in Thorn is therefore completely different from both Pinto and the present invention, and neither Pinto nor Thorn suggest panel overlays which completely cover the respective panels. Amended claim 1 is not obvious in view of Pinto and Thorn.

Claims 2 to 8 depend from amended claim 1 and are therefore distinguished from the references for the same reasons as claim 1, and additionally since they define other features lacking from both of these references. Referring to claim 2, Pinto does not have adjacent panel overlays with angled end faces which are not perpendicular to the outer surface of the panel and which conceal the gap between the panel overlays when the door is viewed from a preselected angle, e.g. from a position in front of the door. Instead, the end faces of adjacent panel overlay members, such as longitudinal members 47 and 48, are perpendicular to the outer face of the panel and do not conceal any gap between the panels. Referring to claim 4, the panel overlay members in Pinto do not have a rectangular perimeter in registration with a perimeter of the panel. Instead, the panel overlay members in Pinto are rib-like members of much smaller perimeter dimensions than those of the panel itself, and do not have perimeters which are in registration with the perimeter of any panel (see Figure 2 – members 26, 28, 31 and 32 are each located completely within and spaced from the perimeters of the panels 14 and 11 over which they extend).

Referring to claim 6, the Examiner contends that Thorn teaches forming door members from molded urethane materials and that it would be obvious to modify the overlays of Pinto to form them from molded urethane. This is incorrect. Thorn does not teach forming a door from molded urethane. The outer skins of the door in Thorn are formed of glass fiber reinforced thermosetting resin, and there is no part which overlays these skins. Instead, they form part of an overall molded panel door (see Figure 7). Only the interior core 24 of the door, between the outer skins 21, 22, is formed of rigid urethane foam. This part of Thorn is equivalent to the core of the door sections 12, 13 between the outer layers 15 in Pinto (Figure 3), not to the overlay members in Pinto.

There is nothing in the teachings of Thorn which would suggest to one skilled in the field that the exterior, exposed overlay members in Pinto could advantageously be made of molded urethane foam material.

It is therefore submitted that claims 1 to 8 are not obvious in view of Pinto and Thorn, which both lack a number of the features defined in these claims, and reconsideration and reversal of the rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

New claim 15 and claim 13, which depends from claim 15, are also distinguished from Pinto and Thorn. Referring to claim 15, neither reference suggests panel overlays for a roll-up panel door which are each of shape and dimensions corresponding to that of a respective panel of the door so that they completely cover the outer surface of the respective panel when secured to the door. Referring to claim 13, Thorn describes only the core of a panel door of urethane material, and does not suggest forming an external, overlay member of such material.

It is therefore submitted that claims 15 and 13 are also not obvious in view of Pinto and Thorn.

New independent claim 16 is also distinguished from these references for similar reasons to claim 1. Neither reference suggests a plurality of panel overlays, each panel overlay being of predetermined shape and dimensions substantially matching the shape and dimensions of a respective door panel, nor securing such overlays to the outer surfaces of respective panels so that each overlay completely covers and conceals the respective outer panel surface. The overlays in Pinto do not collectively form a façade simulating an object. Instead, it is the overlays combined with the underlying exposed surfaces of the door panels which determine the appearance of the garage door. Pinto has overlays which only cover part of the respective panels, while Thorn does not even have any overlays on his door.

New independent claim 17 is directed to a method of making a multiple section, roll up door, and is also fully distinguished from the references. In rejecting claims 1 to 8 and 13, the Examiner notes that the process by which an apparatus is made is not

given patentable weight in an apparatus claim. In spite of this, the apparatus as claimed in amended claim 1 and the other independent claims defines structure which is clearly lacking from the cited references, notably a one-piece panel overlay attached to each panel which completely covers and conceals the outer surface of the panel, and has an outer surface having a shape or contour which simulates part of a selected object. Claim 17 defines a method of making this structure which is also fully distinguished from the references.

The method of claim 17 is completely different from the method described by Pinto, in which overlay members in the form of beams or ribs are adhered to extend over the series of door panels, and are then cut along the transverse joint lines between successive panels. It is also completely different from the method of Thorn, in which a space between the outer skins is filled with urethane foam and the resultant panel is compression molded to form the desired shape of an entire door, not an overlay to a single door panel. In contrast, the method of this invention, as illustrated in Figures 7 to 10 and described in paragraph 30 on page 10 of the application, comprises taking a plurality of impressions of a selected object to be duplicated, each impression corresponding to one section of a roll-up sectional door to be fabricated, then forming a mold from each impression and molding a panel overlay in each mold, and finally securing each panel overlay to the outer face of a respective pivoted panel of the roll-up door so that it completely covers and conceals the outer surface of the panel, the panel overlays together forming a façade simulating the object from which the impressions were originally taken. Such a method is not described or suggested by the references.

It is submitted that the foregoing amendment and argument deals with all outstanding grounds of objection and rejection, and that all claims now remaining in this application, specifically claims 1 to 8 and 12 to 18, are now in condition for allowance.

Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If there are any outstanding objections which could be dealt with by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 26, 2005

By: Katherine Proctor
Katherine Proctor
Agent for Applicant
Registration No.: 31,468

GORDON & REES LLP
101 West Broadway, Suite 1600
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 696-6700
Facsimile: (619) 696-7124

Docket No: BDOOR 1029960 (8528-PA01)